

REMARKS

The drawings have been objected to as failing to include a term used in the description. The specification has been amended to replace the term “SME” with “SMI.”

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 has been amended for improved clarity. Applicant's also note that acquisition of a control clock, as recited in the claim, is appropriate. As described in the specification, “a reference oscillator REO, which supplies an output signal S_{REF} is provided in a known fashion, and said signal is then used in the way described below to acquire a control clock and to derive the channel frequencies necessary for the transceiver and transmitter.” Then Examiner then comments on his interpretation of the phrase “the frequency of the reference...do not occur in a reception channel.” Applicant's respectfully disagree. The specification makes it clear that the frequency of the reference oscillator is selected such, that it is at least of the same order of magnitude of the bandwidth, i.e. of either the same order of magnitude of the bandwidth or larger.

Claims 6-8 have been amended for improved clarity and/or to depend from claim 5.

Claim 9 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments.

Claims 1-6¹ and 10 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Meador in view of Chabas, further in view of Butterfield, further in view of Pasternak. Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Meador in view of Chabas, further in view of Butterfield, further in view of Pasternak, further in view of Jakobsson.

The rejections are respectfully traversed since Meador is not an appropriate prior art reference. The present application has a filing date of December 3, 1999, which is prior to the filing date of the Meador reference, namely February 29, 2000. Applicant's request that the Examiner accordingly withdraw the rejection of record.

¹ It appears that the Examiner intended to reject claims 1-8 and 10 since paragraph 9, on page 9 of the Office Action summarily rejected claims 7 and 8. Applicant's proceed under this assumption.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 44912-20097.00. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: July 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Kevin R. Spivak

Registration No.: 43,148

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7762